## Topicality

### 1NC – T – Government

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a just government or a subset of governments.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a vacuum, not a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation – they spec Europe

#### Standards –

#### 1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits – there are infinite governments that could be just – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff – i.e. laws about the right to strike in the US are different than in New Zealand – means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing.

#### 3] TVA – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole adv, solves your offense

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs – it constrains your ability to evaluate the rest of the flow because they require fair evaluation.

#### Drop the debater – T indicts their entire advocacy so drop the arg is the same thing

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention but we creates a race to the top where we create the best norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## Counterplans

### 1NC – Article 7 CP

#### CP: The European Union ought to sanction member nations of the European Union who are deemed as authoritarian by the General Affairs Council using the procedures denoted by Article 7. Sanctions by the EU will result in temporary suspensions of sanctioned member nation’s voting rights in the European Union.

**HRW 21** [Human Rights Watch, 6-18-2021, "EU: Use Article 7 Now to Protect European Values," https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/06/18/eu-use-article-7-now-protect-european-values]//DDPT

(Brussels) – [European Union](https://www.hrw.org/europe/central-asia/european-union) affairs ministers should put the governments of Hungary and Poland on notice that there is no place for attacks on the rule of law in the EU and step up scrutiny of their human rights-abusive policies, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), the International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH), the Open Society European Policy Institute (OSEPI) and Reporters Without Borders (RSF) said today. Ministers from EU member states meeting in the General Affairs Council session on June 22, 2021 will discuss the situations in Poland and Hungary under the Article 7 procedure. Article 7 is the mechanism provided for in the EU treaty to hold accountable governments whose actions threaten the bloc’s rule of law, human rights, and democratic principles. “The actions by Poland and Hungary show that leaving rule-of-law breaches unchecked undermines democratic institutions and eventually affects the human rights and lives of everyone in those countries,” said [Philippe Dam](https://www.hrw.org/about/people/philippe-dam), Europe and Central Asia advocacy director at Human Rights Watch. “The June 22 hearings are a good start, but much more is needed to prove member states’ resolve to protect EU’s democratic values and reaffirm, loud and clear, that there is no room in the EU for those who disown them,” said Elena Crespi, Western Europe Programme Director at FIDH. Resuming hearings on the situations in Hungary and Poland under Article 7 is a strong signal from the Council that violations of EU principles will not go unnoticed within the Union, the organizations said. But EU ministers have a responsibility to make up for the time lost and show readiness to take further action as the situations in both countries continue to deteriorate. The European Commission invoked Article 7 in December 2017 for the first time since its creation in response to the dramatic erosion of judicial independence in Poland by the Law and Justice (PiS) Party government. But the EU Council, consisting of the member states, has not held a formal hearing regarding the situation since [September 2018](https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/gac/2018/09/18/). The European Parliament triggered Article 7 in September 2018 for Hungary because of the repeated deliberate attacks on democratic institutions and human rights by the Fidesz-led government, but the Council has not convened a hearing on the matter since [December 2019](https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/gac/2019/12/10/). EU officials contended that discussions related to Article 7 could not take place during the Covid-19 pandemic, allegedly because EU ministers could not meet in person during this period. While EU action has stalled, Poland’s government has continued to strengthen its grip on the judiciary. Many judges and prosecutors have faced arbitrary disciplinary proceedings for speaking up against problematic judicial reforms. The government has used a politically compromised Constitutional Tribunal to bypass parliamentary objections to its efforts to undermine independent institutions and erode rights across the board. The concerns over the functioning of the Tribunal include, in particular, mishandling of cases by its president and unlawful change in the composition of the already designated hearing benches. In October 2020, at the behest of the Polish government, the Constitutional Tribunal severely undermined access to sexual and reproductive rights for women in Poland by extending the existing ban on abortion to include cases of “severe and irreversible fetal defect or incurable illness that threatens the fetus’ life”. In April, the government used the same tribunal to discontinue the mandate of the country’s [human rights Ombudsman](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/04/15/polands-top-watchdog-removed-governments-behest), despite the delays in the appointment of a successor. The government is also using the Constitutional Tribunal to seek decisions on the validity of the Istanbul Convention on preventing violence against women and to try to undermine the binding nature of decisions by the EU Court of Justice on Polish law. In Hungary, the government used the Covid-19 pandemic as a pretext to intensify its attacks on the rule of law and public institutions, increase executive power, and limit human rights, including the rights to freedom of expression, information, and peaceful assembly. Hungary finally abided by the [June 2020 EU Court decision](https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-06/cp200073en.pdf) by [repealing](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/04/23/hungarys-scrapping-ngo-law-insufficient-protect-civil-society) a [2017 law](https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/06/12/hungary-bill-seeks-stifle-independent-groups) forcing civil society organizations receiving over 20,000 EUR per year in foreign funds to register as foreign-funded. But at the same time the government introduced a new bill requiring the national State Audit Office to conduct annual financial inspections of civil society organizations that report more than around 55,000 EUR, with the risk that it could create a new method to demonize and obstruct the work of watchdog groups. The draft bill leaves untouched the controversial [2018 law criminalizing groups giving assistance](https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/06/22/hungary-tries-stop-asylum-seekers-new-law) to asylum seekers. In July 2020, the editor-in-chief of Hungary’s largest online independent daily, Index.hu, [was fired as](https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/07/24/hungary-editors-sacking-blow-press-freedom) a result of a financial takeover of the company controlling its revenues by a person with close links to the country’s ruling party. In September, the Media Council, a broadcast regulator tied to the executive after controversial changes passed early in the decade, revoked the frequency for the independent Budapest radio station Klubradio, forcing it off the air. On June 9, the European Commission opened a [new legal proceeding](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/inf_21_2743) against Hungary on the basis that the decision to take Klubradio off the air was discriminatory and non-transparent. Civil society groups in Poland, Hungary, and elsewhere in the EU have criticized the European Council and European Commission for failing to uphold the bloc’s founding values of respect for human rights and the rule of law in countries that breach them. In December, the EU established a new mechanism conditioning EU funding upon respect for the rule of law, but both the European Commission and the Council have succumbed to Hungary and Poland’s blackmailing and announced they would not start enforcing the measure until autumn. On June 10, the [European Parliament](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20210604IPR05528/rule-of-law-parliament-prepares-to-sue-commission-for-failure-to-act) took the European Commission to Court if it further delays the implementation of the mechanism. European ministers should continue to convene regular hearings on the situations in Poland and Hungary and take all steps available under Article 7 to hold both governments to account for violating the EU’s core values. These should include adopting specific rule-of-law recommendations that Poland and Hungary’s governments should carry out by a set deadline and, absent any concrete steps toward compliance, work toward the required four-fifth vote to determine that there is a clear risk of a serious breach of the values protected by the EU treaty. Such a determination would open up the possibility of sanctions that the Council could adopt, by unanimity, to react to this breach. “After years of foot-dragging, it’s important for EU states to finally come together to scrutinize the situation in Poland and Hungary,” said Eve Geddie, Head of European Institutions Office at Amnesty International. “EU states have an obligation to act together to halt the hollowing out of public institutions and attacks on the rule of law in Poland, Hungary and any other member state that threatens core European values,” said Natacha Kazatchkine, Head of internal EU policy at Open Society European Policy Institute.

## Disadvantages

### 1NC – Econ Generic

#### The European economy is on an upward trend – the current path is good but preserving the squo is necessary.

**Nelson 5/12** [Eshe Nelson, 5-12-2021, "Europe upgrades its economic outlook as the British economy rebounds.," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/27/business/europe-upgrades-its-economic-outlook-as-the-british-economy-rebounds.html]//DDPT

The economic outlook has brightened considerably across [Europe](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/17/world/europe/uk-employment-jobs.html) after lockdowns restricted growth at the start of the year. Now, economists foresee the complete recovery by the end of next year from the early effects of the pandemic. The [British economy](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/27/business/britain-budget-sunak.html) grew 2.1 percent in March from the previous month, the Office for National Statistics said on Wednesday. The reopening of schools was one of the biggest reasons for the larger-than-expected jump in economic growth, as well as a rise in retail spending even though many stores remained closed because of lockdowns. The statistics agency estimated that gross domestic product fell 1.5 percent in the first quarter, slightly less than economists surveyed by Bloomberg had predicted, while the country was under lockdown with nonessential stores, restaurants and other services such as hairdressers shut. Though the [British economy](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/27/business/britain-budget-sunak.html) is still nearly 9 percent smaller than it was at the end of 2019, before the pandemic, the [Bank of England](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/06/business/bank-of-england-predicts-a-faster-recovery-and-slows-down-its-bond-buying-program.html) forecasts it to return to that size by the end of this year.

#### Strikes are uniquely harmful to the economy.

**Tenza 20** [Mlungisi Tenza (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal). “The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa.” Obiter vol.41 n.3 Port Elizabeth 2020. JDN. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004]

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

#### Everyone Dies™

**Tønnesson 15** [Tønnesson, Stein. “Deterrence, Interdependence and Sino–US Peace.” International Area Studies Review, vol. 18, no. 3, Sept. 2015, pp. 297–311, doi:[10.1177/2233865915596660](https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865915596660).] //DD PT

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

## Case

### 1NC – Overview

#### Vote negative on presumption – the aff only fiats that the government recognizes ability to strike, however they have no evidence that says that recognition increases strikes or a lack of recognition means no strikes which means the aff doesn’t do anything. Zero risk exists – they have the burden of proof to warrant arguments

### 1NC – No UQ

#### European authoritarianism is inevitable – NATO has already become infested with authoritarian ideology and there’s nothing strikes can do about that.

**Samp 17** [Lisa Sawyer Samp, 8-25-2017, "How to Deal with Authoritarianism Inside NATO," War on the Rocks, [https://warontherocks.com/2017/08/how-to-deal-with-authoritarianism-inside-nato/]//DDPT](https://warontherocks.com/2017/08/how-to-deal-with-authoritarianism-inside-nato/%5d//DDPT)

The time has come to separate our NATO relationship from our disapproval of domestic Greek politics … [I]t doesn’t make sense to let our security relationships with Greece — her NATO role, common facilities, Sixth Fleet support — deteriorate further. In short, the United States felt that differences between allies should be communicated bilaterally, not within NATO. In the absence of a consensus approach, allies on both sides of the debate needed to set fairer expectations for NATO’s role and avoid ultimatums or overly hard lines that undermined alliance unity. Nations can be as principled or pragmatic as they wish in their national policies, but they must be prepared to bring some flexibility to discussions inside NATO for the sake of solidarity. The June 1971 meeting of NATO foreign ministers in [Lisbon](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2015.1046388?journalCode=rinh20) stands out as an example of inflexibility leading to disunity. After unsuccessful attempts to move the location of the meeting and threats of a boycott, allies in the values-first camp geared up to openly confront their Portuguese and Greek counterparts (some at the insistence of their home parliaments). Despite appeals to reconsider by Washington and others, Norway’s foreign minister offered a strong rebuke of the [Portuguese](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2015.1046388?journalCode=rinh20) and [Greek](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09592296.2011.549745) regimes, drawing fiery responses from their respective foreign ministers. The episode also elicited a firm chiding from [NATO Secretary General Brosio](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2015.1046388?journalCode=rinh20): I hope that the discussion which took place tonight will show how useless, futile and, I think, dangerous for the alliance it is to allow this discussion to repeat itself. If we undermine our solidarity, we run the risk of undermining the substance of our alliance and in such a case it would be of little avail to try to save its image. In the end, Norway’s principled, yet uncompromising, position had no effect on the behavior of either regime. It served only to isolate Norway and weaken the values-first coalition; shine a spotlight on NATO’s internal divisions; reinvigorate public debate over the alliance’s unpopular association with both regimes; and distract from the core work of the alliance. A slightly more nuanced, less acerbic speech could have precluded the dust up. Those on the other side of the debate were likewise no model of compromise or restraint. The larger allies frequently took positions that exacerbated tensions and proposed steps they knew would be politically untenable for Northern European nations. In 1971, for example, the West German government proposed using NATO as the vehicle for [joint military sales](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07075332.2015.1046388?journalCode=rinh20) to nations that would otherwise be too controversial to sell arms to directly, namely Portugal, Greece, and Turkey. While rejected before gaining much momentum, such a plan would obviously have been a nonstarter for the smaller allies and could only be seen as inflammatory and unnecessarily provocative. Another incident — this time involving the approval of a NATO report recommending immediate arms sales to Greece and Turkey — sparked an alliance-wide imbroglio that led to a flurry of competing demarches and unhelpful ally-shaming. The Greeks threatened to leave NATO if the report recommending the sales was not approved while the Danes and Norwegians drew a firm opposing line. Eventually, not wanting to [“set off a bomb”](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09592296.2011.549745) within the alliance, Denmark and Norway agreed to a so-called footnote solution, which put their objections on the record but allowed the report to go forward. Advocating that NATO weigh in so unequivocally in support of the Greek colonels not only crossed known Danish and Norwegian red lines, but also weakened the alliance’s credibility and legitimacy as a “white hat” organization standing up to the evils of communism. It also negatively impacted public support for NATO among allied constituencies. The issue of bilateral arms sales was one NATO should have stayed out of.

#### Workers don’t care whether or not they actually have the right to strike recognized – they’ll do them with or without the aff.

Notes 19 [10-17-2019, "Why Strikes Matter," Labor Notes, https://labornotes.org/2019/10/why-strikes-matter]//DDPT

“Why do you rob banks?” a reporter once asked Willie Sutton. “Because that’s where the money is,” the infamous thief replied. Why go on strike? Because that’s where our power is. Teachers in West Virginia showed it in 2018 when they walked out, in a strike that bubbled up from below, surprising even their statewide union leaders. No one seemed concerned that public sector strikes were unlawful in West Virginia. “What are they going to do, fire us all?” said Jay O’Neal, treasurer for the Kanawha County local. “Who would they get to replace us?” Already the state had 700 teaching vacancies, thanks to the rock-bottom pay the strikers were protesting. After 13 days out, the teachers declared victory and returned to their classrooms with a 5 percent raise. They had also backed off corporate education “reformers” on a host of other issues. The biggest lesson: “Our labor is ours first,” West Virginia teacher Nicole McCormick told the crowd at the Labor Notes Conference that spring. “It is up to us to give our labor, or to withhold it.” That’s the fundamental truth on which the labor movement was built. Strikes by unorganized workers led to the founding of unions. Strikes won the first union contracts. Strikes over the years won bigger paychecks, vacations, seniority rights, and the right to tell the foreman “that’s not my job.” Without strikes we would have no labor movement, no unions, no contracts, and a far worse working and living situation. In short, strikes are the strongest tool in workers’ toolbox—our power not just to ask, but to force our employers to concede something. DISCOVER YOUR POWER The key word is “force.” A strike is not just a symbolic protest. It works because we withhold something that the employer needs—its production, its good public image, its profits, and above all its control over us. As one union slogan has it, “this university works because we do”—or this company, or this city. A strike reveals something that employers would prefer we not notice: they need us. Workplaces are typically run as dictatorships. The discovery that your boss does not have absolute power over you—and that in fact, you and your co-workers can exert power over him—is a revelation. There’s no feeling like it. Going on strike changes you, personally and as a union. “Walking into work the first day back chanting ‘one day longer, one day stronger’ was the best morning I’ve ever had at Verizon,” said Pam Galpern, a field tech and mobilizer with Communication Workers Local 1101, after workers beat the corporate giant in a 45-day strike in 2016. “There was such a tremendous feeling of accomplishment. People were smiling and happy. It was like a complete 180-degree difference from before the strike,” when supervisors had been micromanaging and writing workers up for the smallest infractions. In a good strike, everyone has a meaningful role. Strikers develop new skills and a deeper sense that they own and run their union. New leaders emerge from the ranks and go on to become stewards. New friendships are formed; workers who didn’t know or trust one another before forge bonds of solidarity. A few stubborn co-workers finally see why the union matters and sign on as members. Allies from faith groups, neighborhood groups, or other unions adopt your cause. You and your co-workers lose some fear of the boss—and the boss gains some fear of you. In all these ways and more—not to mention the contract gains you may win—a strike can be a tremendous union-building activity.

#### Strikes are guaranteed with or without the aff.

Greenhouse 18 [Steven Greenhouse, 5-9-2018, "Opinion," New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/09/opinion/teacher-strikes-illegal-arizona-carolina.html>] //DDPT

In the five states where teachers have gone on strike this year, teachers complain about many of the same things: low salaries, an education funding squeeze and teacher shortages. They have something else in common. In four of the five — Arizona, Kentucky, Oklahoma and West Virginia — these strikes are illegal under state law. (Colorado, the fifth state where teachers walked out, allows them.) While private-sector workers generally have a right to strike under federal law, state law governs whether teachers and other state and local government workers can strike. Three dozen states have laws prohibiting teachers from striking. Clearly, making teacher strikes illegal will not necessarily prevent them. In the states where teachers walked out, many teachers felt they had to beg their state legislatures to approve raises and the funding to pay for them. But their pleas were largely ignored. Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown University, says that when workers feel they are at a dead end in negotiating raises, militant outbursts — such as illegal walkouts — are inevitable. “When collective bargaining isn’t allowed or doesn’t work, that doesn’t mean collective action isn’t possible,” he said. Labor’s most potent weapon is the strike, even when it’s illegal. Workers will often risk engaging in an illegal strike, even though it could mean getting fined, fired and conceivably jailed. In a legal strike, workers typically lose just a few days’ or weeks’ pay. Explosions of worker militancy have been a recurring pattern throughout American history. West Virginia teachers, for example, said their walkout was inspired by their state’s coal miners, who were part of a historic miners’ strike during World War II. Ten days after Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt summoned labor and business leaders to a conference where unions pledged not to strike during the war. The National War Labor Board, which included labor representatives, dictated a nationwide formula that capped how large a raise unions could obtain in bargaining. But the raises often failed to keep up with inflation, angering millions of workers. As a result, there were dozens of short wildcat strikes — strikes without union authorization — in defiance of Roosevelt and union leaders. The biggest confrontation came in 1943, when the United Mine Workers’ brilliant but bullheaded president, John L. Lewis, gave 500,000 coal miners a wink and a nod, tacit approval for a walkout. Roosevelt implored the miners to return to work. “Every idle miner directly and individually is obstructing the war effort,” he said in a fireside chat. He had the federal government seize the mines and ordered miners back to work, but eager to restore labor peace, he figured out a way to meet most of their pay demands. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order giving most federal employees the right to bargain collectively over some working conditions, but not wages, and he barred them from striking. For years, postal workers seethed about low pay, and their frustration boiled over after members of Congress received a 41 percent raise in 1969. On March 18, 1970, letter carriers walked out in New York City, and within days, more than 150,000 of the nation’s 600,000 postal workers had joined the illegal strike. One letter carrier boasted that the strikers were “standing 10 feet tall, instead of groveling in the dust.” During the 1970 postal workers’ strike, military personnel sorted mail at New York City’s main post office. President Richard M. Nixon denounced the strike, but he didn’t seek to fire or jail the strikers. He mobilized 24,000 military personnel to deliver the mail — not very successfully — and reached a deal that ended the strike after eight days. The postal workers won an initial 6 percent raise, and when Nixon signed the Postal Reorganization Act that summer, they received an additional 8 percent. H. R. Haldeman, Nixon’s chief of staff, acknowledged a big obstacle to punishing these unlawful strikers. “The mailman is a family friend, so you can’t hurt him,” Haldeman said. State officials unhappy about the recent strikes have realized the same thing: They can’t really punish or replace the teachers. They’re too popular, there are too many to replace, and if state officials try to jail a few ringleaders, that might spur new strikes. Not every illegal walkout ends well for workers. When air traffic controllers went on strike in 1981, President Ronald Reagan fired 11,345 controllers and rallied the public against their union, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, emphasizing that every controller had taken a no-strike pledge upon being hired. Reagan also lambasted the union for rejecting the 11 percent raise his administration was offering, about twice what other federal employees had received at the time. With the end of the Arizona teachers’ walkout last Thursday, there are rumblings about which state might be next. In North Carolina, educators are angry that teacher salaries and per-pupil spending have not kept up with inflation. Even though teacher strikes are illegal in North Carolina, teachers there say they will walk out next Wednesday, the day that the state legislature opens. Lawmakers should take them seriously. Teachers have so far managed to win gains and skirt the law without any penalty because public opinion — and a lot of history — seems to be on their side.

### 1NC – Solvency Turn

#### Illegal strikes solve better for democracy and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the authoritarian state – turns case because it’s much better to ensure their rights

Reddy 21 [Diana S. Reddy, 01-06-2021, "“There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike”: Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy," Yale Law Journal, [https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy]//DD](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy%5d//DD) PT

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.[183](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

#### Teacher strikes prove that illegal strikes are more effective – the legal system waters down the efficacy of legal strikes.

Blanc 20 [Eric Blanc, doctoral candidate in sociology at NYU researching public sector labor organizing, "Breaking the law: Strike bans and labor revitalization in the red state revolt." Labor Studies Journal (2020)]//DDPT

For decades, labor leaders and sympathetic scholars have put forward a wide array of proposals for reversing the fortunes of the labor movement. Most have sought either to work around draconian legal restrictions or to reform these away through legislative efforts. This paper has examined the early 2018 statewide education strikes to test the feasibility of an alternative path to labor revitalization: illegal strike action. Breaking the law was a central dynamic in the two most successful strikes of the 2018 red state revolt—that is, West Virginia and Arizona. Organizers systematically built up the school-site organization and momentum necessary to enable individual educators to take the risk of participating in an illegal strike. In contrast, Oklahoma’s legal work stoppage floundered, at least in part, because a legal walkout required that teachers rely on the support of their district employers, rather than their own independent organization. In addition, respecting the law undercut the potential for a united walkout of all school employees.

### 1NC – AT: Democracy

#### No UQ – The Biden administration is intensely focused on democracy and is pushing it abroad.

**Wolf 6/15** [Zachary B. Wolf, CNN, 6-15-2021, "Analysis: Biden pushes democracy abroad. Republicans openly question it at home," CNN, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/06/15/politics/biden-democracy-us-abroad/index.html>]

The defense of democracy has so far been the ideological cause of Biden's presidency. "This is democracy's day," he said in his inaugural address, promising to pursue unity at all costs and defend people's rights to disagree. He's come back to the theme repeatedly, including in his [address to Congress](https://www.cnn.com/interactive/2021/04/politics/biden-address-annotated/) in April, when he declared: "We have to prove that democracy still works." Earlier this week, as he brought NATO and members of the G7 in line, he said: "I think we're in a contest -- not with China per se, but a contest with autocrats, autocratic governments around the world -- as to whether or not democracies can compete with them in the rapidly changing 21st century."

#### Democracy is unsustainable and causes war – 2500 years of history prove.

Brooks 17 [Rosa Brooks, 1-6-2017, "Democracy Is Dependent on War," WSJ, https://www.wsj.com/articles/democracy-is-dependent-on-war-1483741787]

Some books should come stamped with a surgeon general's warning: "Likely to cause discomfort," perhaps, or "Not suitable for romantics." The political scientists John Ferejohn and Frances McCall Rosenbluth have written such a book: "Forged Through Fire: War, Peace and the Democratic Bargain" is not for the faint of heart.¶ It begins with a paradox. "Humans have inflicted untold horrors on each other through wars," Mr. Ferejohn and Ms. Rosenbluth write, but these wars have also been responsible for fostering one of our "most cherished human values": modern democracy, with its unique combination of universal suffrage and property rights.¶ This isn't the story we're taught in high-school civics. But it's a compelling one, powerfully told by two scholars with mastery of their subject. The authors walk the reader through 2,500 bloody years of Western history, from the Peloponnesian wars to the war in Vietnam, highlighting, again and again, a brutal trade-off: The emergence and consolidation of democracy depends on warfare, and a particular kind of warfare, at that.¶ Here's the logic: The rich and powerful prefer to remain that way, and are, as a general rule, disinclined to share either wealth or political power with the poor. Only when elites are faced with external military threats do the poor become valuable to the rich. This is so because armies have traditionally required bodies -- and plenty of them.¶ This, the authors argue, is the awful "alchemy of iron and blood" that produces democracy. Manpower-intensive forms of warfare require the large-scale mobilization of the population, which forces elites facing external threats to grant political concessions to the common man. Mr. Ferejohn and Ms. Rosenbluth are not the first to chart the linkages between warfare and the evolution of the modern democratic state, but their magisterial volume makes the case in persuasive and explicit detail.¶ We begin in Athens, where the shift from aristocracy to democracy was driven by the need to defend the city against foreign invasion. In 508 B.C., Cleisthenes "promised to turn political power over to the Athenian public in exchange for their help in repelling Spartan intervention," and the great age of Athenian democracy was born.¶ It might soon have died, too, but for the existence of near-continuous external threats during the Peloponnesian and Persian wars, and the fact that Athenian naval supremacy soon came to require the active participation of tens of thousands of ordinary men. "Whether they liked it or not," note the authors, "Athens' wealthy and conservative citizens seem to have understood that the city's survival rested in the hands of thousands of commoners who rowed the triremes."¶ Similar dynamics led Rome's elites to grant freedom, land, citizenship and the franchise to an expanding body of commoners and ultimately to residents of far-flung colonial outposts. As in Athens, "Roman military accomplishments rested on wide manpower mobilization rewarded by . . . political voice."¶ But not all wars produce democracy. In medieval Europe, feudal lords were able to rely mainly on small forces of heavy cavalry to sustain their power, not on large-scale mobilization of the poor, and this mostly eliminated the need to offer political concessions to the masses in exchange for military service.¶ Later, in early modern Europe, "the effective use of gunpowder decisively tipped the balance away from the cavalry-dominated militaries of the previous 500 years and in favor of mass armies . . . shifting political power upward to leaders who could finance and maintain such large armies." Even so, for a time most European governments were able to finance armies with plunder from the New World, "or, where necessary, through exchanges of favors with merchants that were less destabilizing than the bargains [monarchs] would otherwise have had to strike with the poor." As a result, pressures to democratize remained minimal and episodic. "As long as monarchies could buy armies with money, blood did not buy voting rights, as it had in Athens and Rome," the authors write.¶ It was only in the 19th and 20th centuries, Mr. Ferejohn and Ms. Rosenbluth observe, that conditions once again became favorable for the widespread expansion of democracy. The French Republic's levee en masse set the stage: Mass mobilizations required both an effective administrative state and eventually a more egalitarian approach to politics. By the end of the 19th century, both France and Germany had "enormous standing armies" and "both had adopted representative government," with universal suffrage placating the masses, counterbalanced by protections for property rights to assuage the concerns of the wealthy.¶ In much of Europe, however, the interests of the wealthy and the working class remained at odds. It "took the white-hot wars of the twentieth century, which required both money and manpower, to hinge them into a single coalition in favor of representative democracy," the authors write.¶ When it happened, it happened quickly. Norway and Sweden initiated universal military conscription at the beginning of the 20th century; within a decade, both had also granted universal male suffrage. In Britain, conscription did not begin until 1916; by 1918, universal male suffrage had also been granted. By the end of World War II, 60 million people were dead, but democracy had become the norm throughout the West.¶ "Forged Through Fire" is full of grim lessons. One lesson: warfare, as the authors of this book soberly remind us, has been a near-constant throughout human history. Those inclined to take solace in the post World War II decline of interstate wars might pause to consider that 70 years is, in the grand scheme of things, not a very long time. Another lesson: Those with power have rarely been inclined to relinquish it voluntarily. Only fear and threat have driven the rich and powerful to share -- grudgingly -- with history's have-nots.¶ A third lesson -- perhaps the hardest to swallow -- is that our most cherished modern liberal political values would likely never have triumphed without war and its multiple horrors, and even the democratic gains produced by centuries of war were "neither easy nor inevitable." Democracy depended upon a unique combination of circumstances: technologies favoring manpower-intensive forms of warfare; the lack of external sources of wealth that might have enabled governing elites to purchase military power, rather than coax it from their citizens; and so on. Even with all these conditions present, coercion and propaganda were sometimes sufficient to thwart the development of democracy. Russia and China, for instance, have managed, so far, to buck the trend.¶ All this leads to an uncomfortable question. Wealthy modern states can once again increasingly outsource their security to private contractors, and in any case, the emergence of new military technologies is again reducing the need for mass armies. Drones, surveillance technologies and cyber-warfare make it possible for states to achieve war's traditional ends without much need to mobilize their citizens, shifting the balance of power away from ordinary citizens and back towards governing elites.¶ "When armies no longer need flesh and blood," wonder Mr. Ferejohn and Ms. Rosenbluth, "what can take their place to stabilize democracy?" In other words: forged through war, can democracy survive peace?